

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the Final Office Action of January 14, 2005, are earnestly solicited.

Applicant hereby petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for an extension of time in which to respond to the outstanding Final Office Action and includes a fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) with this response for such extension of time.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 14 have been amended to clarify Applicant's invention and Claims 19 and 20 have been newly submitted, leaving Claims 1—20 pending in the application.

Claims 1, 7—13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breed (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,787 B1) in view of Doyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,188). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Breed is directed to use of pattern recognition technologies to diagnose potential vehicle component failure. The pattern recognition technology, such as a neural network program, is positioned in a centralized, single diagnostic controller which is coupled to a plurality of sensors via the vehicle's data bus. Breed is totally devoid of any teaching or suggestion of, for example, a sensor located with its own dedicated controller within a sensor housing having a mechanism, such as a clamp, for removably coupling the sensor to a preselected location on a vehicle, as called for in independent Claims 1 and 11.

Doyle et al. uses a transmission path normally used to transmit remote keyless entry functional data to additionally transmit diagnostic information related to the

transmitting key fob itself, and Doyle et al. therefore adds nothing to Breed as far as suggesting Applicant's arrangement set forth in independent Claims 1 and 11.

Claim 1, its depending Claims 7—10, and Claim 11 and its depending Claims 12, 13 and 18 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2—6 and 14—17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breed in view of Doyle et al. as applied to Claims 1 and 11, and further in view of Diaz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,822 B1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.


Claims 2—6 depend from Claim 1 and Claims 14—17 depend from Claim 11. Therefore, Claims 2—6 and 14—17 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claims 1 and 11.

New Claims 19 and 20 add the feature of using the vehicle's conventional audio system to broadcast the diagnostic signal to the automotive mechanism. This feature is not taught or suggested by the art of record, and therefore new Claims 19 and 20 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 14 have been amended herein, Claims 3—10 and 12—18, as originally submitted, and Claims 19, 20 submitted herewith are believed to be in condition for allowance, early acknowledgment of which is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 24, 2005

By: 
Gordon K. Harris, Jr., Reg. No. 28,615
(248) 944-6524
Attorney for Applicants

Ralph E. Smith, Reg. No. 35,474
CIMS 483-02-19
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company LLC
DaimlerChrysler Technology Center
800 Chrysler Drive East
Auburn Hills, MI 48326-2757
248-944-6519